arXiv:1301.3394v1 [math.DG] 15 Jan 2013

TRANSPLANTING GEOMETRICAL STRUCTURES

Y. EUH, P. GILKEY, J.H. PARK, AND K. SEKIGAWA

Abstract. We say that a germ $\mathcal{G}$ of a geometric structure can be transplanted into a manifold M if there is a suitable geometric structure on M which agrees with $\mathcal{G}$ on a neighborhood of some point P of M. We show for a wide variety of geometric structures that this transplantation is always possible provided that M does in fact admit some such structure of this type. We use this result to show that a curvature identity which holds in the category of compact manifolds admitting such a structure holds for germs as well and we present examples illustrating this result. We also use this result to show geometrical realization problems which can be solved for germs of structures can in fact be solved in the compact setting as well.

MSC 2010: 53B20 and 53B35.
Keywords: Affine, almost complex, almost para-complex, almost Hermitian, almost para-Hermitian, Hermitian, para-Hermitian, Kähler, Weyl, Kähler–Weyl, para-Kähler, para-Kähler–Weyl, Riemannian, pseudo-Riemannian.

1. Introduction

We shall consider the following geometric structures; precise definitions will be given in Section 2. We fix the dimension m of the underlying manifold and also the signature (p,q) where relevant.

Definition 1.1. Consider the possible structures:

1. Affine structures.
2. Pseudo-Riemannian structures of suitable signature.
3. Almost (para)-complex structures in dimension $m = 2\bar{m}$.
4. Almost (para)-Hermitian structures of suitable signature.
5. (Para)-complex structures in dimension $m = 2\bar{m}$.
6. (Para)-Hermitian structures of suitable signature.
7. (Para)-Kähler structures of suitable signature.
8. Weyl structures of suitable signature.
9. (Para)-Kähler–Weyl structures of suitable signature.

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a structure from this list, let $\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}$ be the germ of such a structure, and let M be a smooth manifold which admits a structure $S_M \in \mathcal{S}$. Fix a point $P \in M$. We say that $\mathcal{G}$ can be *transplanted* in M if there exists a structure $\tilde{S}_M \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\tilde{S}_M$ near P is locally isomorphic to $\mathcal{G}$ and $\tilde{S}_M$ agrees with S_M away from P. We shall make this more precise in Section 2– it is necessary to assume that M admits such a structure to avoid topological difficulties. For example, if $\mathcal{S}$ denotes the structure of Lorentzian metrics of signature $(1, m-1)$, then not every manifold will admit such a structure; similarly, if we are working with almost complex structures, not every manifold admits an almost complex structure.

Such problems arise in many contexts. One can often establish universal curvature identities for compact manifolds by considering the Euler-Lagrange equations of certain characteristic classes – see, for example, results in [10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 26]. One then wants to show these identities hold more generally and this involves a transplanting problem. Similarly, when establishing geometric realization results, one often constructs examples which are only defined on a small neighborhood of the origin – the discussion in [4] provides a nice summary of these problems and we refer to other results in [5, 6, 15, 16]. And one wants to then deduce these geometric realization results also hold in the compact setting.

1.1. Transplantation.

The following is the first main result of this paper; a more precise statement for each of the structures in Definition 1.1 will be given subsequently in Section 2.

Theorem 1.1. *All the structures of Definition 1.1 can be transplanted.*

1.2. Curvature identities.

Theorem 1.1 then yields the second main result of this paper which motivated our investigations in the first instance; we will present several applications in Section 3:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a structure of Definition 1.1. A curvature identity which holds for every $\xi \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ for M compact necessarily holds without the assumption of compactness.*

1.3. Geometric realizability.

Theorem 1.1 and results described in [4] also yield the following result which formed part of the motivation of our paper; we will present several examples illustrating this result in Section 4:

Theorem 1.3. *Every algebraic model of the curvature tensor of a structure from Definition 1.1 is geometrically realizable by a compact manifold.*

2. The proof of Theorem 1.1

Notational conventions. We introduce some basic notational conventions that we shall employ throughout Section 2.

Definition 2.1. Let B_{3r} be the ball of radius $3r$ about the origin in $\mathbb{R}^m$ and let h be a smooth k-tensor defined on B_{3r}. Let $||h||_{3r}$ be the C^0 norm of h and let $||h||_{3r}^1$ be the C^1 norm of h on B_{3r}, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} ||h||_{3r} &:= \sup_{x\in B_{3r},1\le i_1\le m,\dots,1\le i_k\le m} |h_{i_1\dots i_k}(x)|, \\ ||h||_{3r}^1 &:= ||h||_{3r} + \sup_{x\in B_{3r},1\le j\le i_1\le m,\dots,1\le i_k\le m} |\partial_{x_j} h_{i_1\dots i_k}(x)| . \end{aligned}$$

We shall also denote these norms by $||h||$ and $||h||^1$ when no confusion is likely to result. We shall need $||\cdot||^1$ in Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.7 to be able to study geodesic completeness in Section 2.10; in the remaining results we will either study C^0 approximating transplants or simple transplants without estimates.

Definition 2.2. Let P_i be the base points of manifolds M_i. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a structure from the list given in Definition 1.1. Let $S_1 \in \mathcal{S}(M_1)$ be the germ of a suitable structure on M_1 at P_1 and let $S_2 \in \mathcal{S}(M_2)$ be a structure which is defined on all of M_2. We will choose suitably normalized local coordinate systems $\vec{x} = (x^1, ..., x^m)$ centered at P_1 which are defined on an open set $\mathcal{U}_1 \subset M_1$ and suitably normalized coordinates $\vec{y} = (y^1, ..., y^m)$ centered at P_2 which are defined on a open set $\mathcal{U}_2 \subset M_2$. We use these coordinates to identify $\mathcal{U}_1$ and $\mathcal{U}_2$ with B_{3r} and $P_1 = P_2 = 0$ for some $r > 0$; we will often shrink r in the course of a particular discussion. We use the identification $\mathcal{U}_1 = B_{3r}$ to regard S_1 as defining a structure on B_{3r} and we use the identification $\mathcal{U}_2 = B_{3r}$ to regard S_2 as defining a structure on B_{3r} as well. Our task will be to find a structure $\tilde{S}_2 \in \mathcal{S}(B_{3r})$ so that $\tilde{S}_2 = S_1$ on B_r and so that $\tilde{S}_2 = S_2$ on B_{2r}^c; $\tilde{S}_2$ can then be extended to all of M_2 to agree with S_2 on $\mathcal{U}_2^c$. In this setting, we will say that $\tilde{S}_2$ *is isomorphic to* S_1 *near* P_2 *and agrees with* S_2 *away from* P_2.

Definition 2.3. Let $\phi \in C_0^\infty(B_3)$ be a mesa function so $\phi \equiv 1$ on B_1, so $\phi \equiv 0$ on B_2^c, and so $0 \le \phi \le 1$. We let $\phi_r := \phi(x/r)$ be the corresponding mesa function on B_{3r}. There is a constant C which is independent of r so that

$$||\phi_r||_{3r} \le 1 \text{ and } ||\phi_r||_{3r}^1 \le Cr^{-1}\,. \tag{2.a}$$

Definition 2.4. We may decompose $\otimes^2 T^*M = S^2(M) \oplus \Lambda^2(M)$ as the direct sum of the symmetric 2-forms $S^2(M)$ and the alternating 2-forms $\Lambda^2(M)$. If J is an endomorphism of TM with $J^2 = \pm\,\mathrm{Id}$, let $S^2_\pm(M) \subset S^2(M)$ and $\Lambda^2_\pm(M) \subset \Lambda^2(M)$ be the ±1 eigenbundles of the associated action by J on $S^2(M)$ and on $\Lambda^2(M)$. If $\mathbb{V}$ is a smooth vector bundle over M, let $C^\infty(\mathbb{V})$ denote the space of smooth sections to $\mathbb{V}$.

We now treat the structures of Definition 1.1 seriatim; we have chosen the order of presentation to be able to use results about certain structures in the study of subsequent structures. We refer to [8] for further details concerning para-complex geometry. Although partitions of unity are used in the proofs, certain structures require constructions which are far from direct. We shall employ *(para)-Kähler potentials* to examine (para)-Kähler geometry. For use as input in studying subsequent more delicate structures, it will be convenient in many instances to be able to choose $\tilde S_2$ so that $||\tilde S_2 - S_2|| < \epsilon$ or so that $||\tilde S_2 - S_2||^1 < \epsilon$ when $\epsilon > 0$ is given a-priori.

2.1. **Affine structures.** The pair (M, ∇) is called an *affine manifold* and ∇ is said to be an *affine connection* if ∇ is a torsion free connection on the tangent bundle TM.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Let ∇_1 be the germ of a torsion free connection at $P_1 \in M_1$ and let ∇_2 be a torsion free connection on M_2. There exists a torsion free connection $\tilde\nabla_2$ on M_2 so that $\tilde\nabla_2$ is equal to ∇_2 away from P_2, so that $\tilde\nabla_2$ is isomorphic to ∇_1 near P_2, and so that $||\tilde\nabla_2 - \nabla_2|| < \epsilon$.*

Proof. Let $\nabla_{1,\partial_{x_i}}\partial_{x_j} = \Gamma_{1,ij}{}^k\partial_{x_k}$ and $\nabla_{2,\partial_{y_i}}\partial_{y_j} = \Gamma_{2,ij}{}^k\partial_{y_k}$ define the *Christoffel symbols* of the connections where we adopt the *Einstein convention* and sum over repeated indices. Since ∇_1 and ∇_2 are torsion free, we can normalize the coordinate system $\vec x$ (resp. $\vec y$) so that $\Gamma_1(P_1) = 0$ (resp. $\Gamma_2(P_2) = 0$); see, for example, the discussion in [4]. Having chosen $\vec x$ and $\vec y$, we now identify $P_1 = P_2 = 0$ and $\mathcal{U}_1 = \mathcal{U}_2 = B_{3r}$. It is crucial here and it will be crucial in subsequent arguments to normalize the structures before identifying P_1 with P_2; the freedom to adjust $\vec x$ and $\vec y$ separately is an important one. The difference Φ of two connections is tensorial; we set

$$\Phi_{ij}{}^k := \Gamma_{1,ij}{}^k - \Gamma_{2,ij}{}^k \text{ on } B_{3r}\,.$$

Since $\Gamma_1(0) = \Gamma_2(0) = 0$, $\Phi(0) = 0$ so by shrinking r if necessary, we may assume that $||\Phi||_{3r} < \varepsilon$. Set $\tilde\nabla_2 = \phi_r \cdot \nabla_1 + (1 - \phi_r) \cdot \nabla_2$. Then $\tilde\nabla_2$ is torsion free, $\tilde\nabla_2$ agrees with ∇_1 on B_r, $\tilde\nabla_2$ agrees with ∇_2 on B_{2r}^c, and

$$||\tilde\nabla_2 - \nabla_2||_{3r} = ||\phi_r\nabla_1 + (1 - \phi_r)\nabla_2 - \nabla_2||_{3r} = ||\phi_r\Phi||_{3r} < \epsilon. \quad \square$$

2.2. **Pseudo-Riemannian manifolds.** A *pseudo-Riemannian metric of signature* (p, q) is a non-degenerate bilinear form $g \in C^\infty(S^2(T^*M))$ of signature (p, q) on TM; the pair (M, g) is a *pseudo-Riemannian manifold of signature* (p, q). Not every manifold admits such a metric; for example the even dimensional spheres do not admit pseudo-Riemannian metrics of signature (p, q) if $p > 0$ and if $q > 0$.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Let g_1 be the germ of a pseudo-Riemannian metric of signature (p, q) at $P_1 \in M_1$ and let g_2 be a pseudo-Riemannian metric of signature (p, q) on M_2. There exists a pseudo-Riemannian metric $\tilde g_2$ on M_2 so that*

$\tilde g_2$ is equal to g_2 away from P_2, so that $\tilde g_2$ is isomorphic to g_1 near P_2, and so that $||g_2-\tilde g_2||^1<\epsilon$.

Proof. Choose local coordinates $\vec x$ (resp. $\vec y$) near $P_1\in M_1$ (resp. $P_2\in M_2$). Let

$$g_{1,ij}:=g_1(\partial_{x_i},\partial_{x_j})\text{ and }g_{2,ij}:=g_2(\partial_{y_i},\partial_{y_j})\,.$$

By choosing geodesic polar coordinates, we may assume the first derivatives of the metric vanish at the points P_1 and P_2, i.e.

$$\partial_{x_k}g_{1,ij}(P_1)=0\text{ and }\partial_{y_k}g_{2,ij}(P_2)=0\text{ for }1\le i,j,k\le m\,.$$

Since g_1 and g_2 have signature (p,q), by making a linear change of coordinates we can further normalize the choice of $\vec x$ and $\vec y$ so:

$$g_{1,ij}(P_1)=g_{2,ij}(P_2)=\left\{\begin{array}{rl}0&\text{if }i\ne j\\-1&\text{if }i=j\le p\\+1&\text{if }i=j>p\end{array}\right\}.$$

We now identify $P_1=P_2=0\in\mathbb{R}^m$. Because the first derivatives of the metric vanish at 0 and because $g_1(0)=g_2(0)$, we have

$$||g_1-g_2||_{3r}\le Cr^2\text{ and }||g_1-g_2||_{3r}^1\le Cr \tag{2.b}$$

for some constant C which is independent of r if $0\le r<r_0$ is sufficiently small. We set $\tilde g_2:=\phi_rg_1+(1-\phi_r)g_2\in S^2(T^*M)$. Then $\tilde g_2=g_1$ on B_r, and $\tilde g_2=g_2$ on B_{2r}^c. Since $\tilde g-g_2=\phi_r(g_1-g_2)$, we use Equation (2.a) and Equation (2.b) to see:

$$\begin{array}{rcl}||(\tilde g_2-g_2)||_{3r}&\le&||\phi_r||_{3r}\cdot||g_1-g_2||_{3r}\le Cr^2,\\ ||\tilde g_2-g_2||_{3r}^1&\le&C\{||\phi_r||_{3r}^1\cdot||(\tilde g_2-g_2)||_{3r}+||\phi_r||_{3r}\cdot||(\tilde g_2-g_2)||_{3r}^1\}\\&\le&C\cdot r^{-1}\cdot r^2+C\cdot r\le 2C\cdot r\end{array}$$

where C is a generic constant. The desired estimate that $||\tilde g_2-g_2||^1<\epsilon$ now follows by choosing r small enough. Since the set of pseudo-Riemannian metrics on M_2 of signature (p,q) is an open subset of $C^\infty(S^2(T^*M))$ in the C^0 topology, it follows that $\tilde g_2$ is non-degenerate if ϵ is chosen sufficiently small. □

2.3. **Almost (para)-complex structures.** We say that an endomorphism J_+ of TM is an *almost para-complex structure* if $J_+^2=\operatorname{Id}$ and if $\operatorname{Tr}(J_+)=0$; similarly an endomorphism J_- of TM is an *almost complex structure* if $J_-^2=-\operatorname{Id}$; it is then immediate that $\operatorname{Tr}(J_-)=0$. It is convenient to have a common notation although we shall never be discussing both structures at the same time. The existence of an almost (para)-complex structure necessarily implies $m=2\bar m$ is even. Not every manifold admits such a structures; the even dimensional spheres S^m for $m\ge 8$ do not admit such structures. The pair $(M,J_\pm)$ is said to be an *almost (para)-complex manifold.*

Theorem 2.3. *Let $\epsilon>0$ be given. Let $J_{1,\pm}$ be the germ of an almost (para)-complex structure near $P_1\in M_1$ and let $J_{2,\pm}$ be an almost (para)-complex structure on M_2. There exists an almost (para)-complex structure $\tilde J_{2,\pm}$ on M_2 so that $\tilde J_{2,\pm}$ is equal to $J_{2,\pm}$ away from P_2, so that $\tilde J_{2,\pm}$ is isomorphic to $J_{1,\pm}$ near P_2, and so that $||\tilde J_{2,\pm}-J_{2,\pm}||<\epsilon$.*

Proof. Choose local coordinates $\vec x$ (resp. $\vec y$) near $P_1\in M_1$ (resp. $P_2\in M_2$). Make a linear change of coordinates to normalize the coordinate systems so that the structures are isomorphic on $T_{P_i}(M_i)$:

$$\begin{array}{llll}J_\pm(P_1)\partial_{x_i}=\partial_{x_{i+\bar m}}&\text{and}&J_\pm(P_1)\partial_{x_{i+\bar m}}=\pm\partial_{x_i}&\text{for}\quad 1\le i\le\bar m,\\ J_\pm(P_2)\partial_{y_i}=\partial_{y_{i+\bar m}}&\text{and}&J_\pm(P_2)\partial_{y_{i+\bar m}}=\pm\partial_{y_i}&\text{for}\quad 1\le i\le\bar m.\end{array}\tag{2.c}$$

We now identify $P_1 = P_2 = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and have $J_{1,\pm}(P_1) = J_{2,\pm}(P_2)$. By shrinking r if necessary, we may assume

$$||J_{1,\pm} - J_{2,\pm}||_{3r} < \epsilon\,.$$

The convex combination of (para)-complex structures is, of course, not a (para)-complex structure so we must proceed a bit differently and not simply examine $\phi_r J_{1,\pm} + (1-\phi_r)J_{2,\pm}$. For $1 \le i \le \bar m$, we define tangent vector fields e_i and f_i on B_{3r} by setting:

$$e_i := \partial_{x_i}, \quad e_{i+\bar m} := J_{1,\pm} e_i, \quad f_i := \partial_{y_i}, \quad f_{i+\bar m} := J_{2,\pm} f_i\,.$$

Then $\vec e := (e_1, ..., e_m)$ and $\vec f := (f_1, ..., f_m)$ are linearly independent at 0 and hence are frames for TB_{3r} if we shrink r. Furthermore, as $\vec e(0) = \vec f(0)$, we may assume $||\vec e - \vec f||_{3r} < \epsilon$ if we shrink r still further. We may express

$$\vec f(x) = \Theta(x)\cdot \vec e(x) \text{ on } B_{3r} \text{ for } \Theta : B_{3r} \to \mathrm{GL}(m,\mathbb{R}) \text{ with } \Theta(0) = \mathrm{Id}\,.$$

Set $\vec g(x) := \Theta(\phi_r(x)x)\vec e(x)$. Then $\vec g = \vec f$ on B_r and $\vec g = \vec e$ on B_{2r}^c. As $\Theta(0) - \mathrm{Id} = 0$, by shrinking r if necessary, we may estimate

$$||\vec g - \vec e||_{3r} \le C_m ||\Theta - \mathrm{Id}\,||_{3r} \cdot ||\vec e||_{3r} < \epsilon$$

for some universal constant C_m only depending on the underlying dimension of the manifold. The desired extension $\tilde J_{2,\pm}$ may then be defined by setting:

$$\tilde J_{2,\pm} g_i = g_{i+\bar m} \text{ and } \tilde J_{2,\pm} g_{i+\bar m} = \pm g_i \text{ for } 1 \le i \le \bar m. \qquad \square$$

2.4. **Almost (para)-Hermitian structures.** An *almost (para)-Hermitian structure* on a manifold M is a pair $(g, J_\pm)$ where g is a pseudo-Riemannian metric on M, where $J_\pm$ is an almost (para)-complex structure on M, and where $J_\pm^* g = \mp g$. The topological restrictions discussed previously show not every manifold admits such a structure. The triple $(M, g, J_\pm)$ is said to be an *almost (para)-Hermitian manifold.*

Theorem 2.4. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Let $(g_1, J_{1,\pm})$ be the germ of an almost (para)-Hermitian structure of signature (p,q) near $P_1 \in M_1$ and let $(g_2, J_{2,\pm})$ be an almost (para)-Hermitian structure on M_2 of signature (p,q). There exists an almost (para)-Hermitian structure $(\tilde g_2, \tilde J_{2,\pm})$ on M_2 so $(\tilde g_2, \tilde J_{2,\pm})$ is equal to $(g_2, J_{2,\pm})$ away from P_2, so $(\tilde g_2, \tilde J_{2,\pm})$ is isomorphic to $(g_1, J_{1,\pm})$ near P_2, so $||\tilde g_2 - g_2|| < \epsilon$, and so $||\tilde J_{2,\pm} - J_{2,\pm}|| < \epsilon$.*

Proof. We choose normalized coordinate systems $\vec x$ and $\vec y$ so that the relations of Equation (2.c) hold. In the complex setting, we have $p = 2\bar q$ and $q = 2\bar q$ are both even. Since g_1 and g_2 have the same signature, we can make a linear change of coordinates preserving the normalizations of Equation (2.c) so that in the complex setting,

$$g_{\nu,ij}(P_\nu) = \left\{\begin{array}{rlll} 0 & \text{if} & i \ne j & \\ -1 & \text{if} & i = j \le \bar p & \text{or} \quad \bar m + 1 \le i \le \bar m + \bar p \\ +1 & \text{if} & \bar p < i = j \le \bar m & \text{or} \quad \bar m + 1 + \bar p < i \le m \end{array}\right\}. \qquad (2.\mathrm{d})$$

In the para-complex setting, we have $p = q = \bar m$ since g_ν necessarily has neutral signature. We normalize the choice of coordinates so

$$g_{\nu,ij}(P_\nu) = \left\{\begin{array}{rll} 0 & \text{if} & i \ne j \\ -1 & \text{if} & 1 \le i = j \le \bar m \\ +1 & \text{if} & \bar m < i = j \le m \end{array}\right\}. \qquad (2.\mathrm{e})$$

We now identify $P_1 = P_2 = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and have $g_1(0) = g_2(0)$ and $J_{1,\pm}(0) = J_{2,\pm}(0)$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Let $\delta = \delta(\epsilon)$ to be chosen presently. We use Theorem 2.2

and Theorem 2.3 to define an almost (para)-complex structure $\tilde J_{2,\pm}$ and a pseudo-Riemannian metric g_3 so that:

$$\begin{array}{lll}\tilde J_{2,\pm}=J_{1,\pm}\text{ on }B_r, & \tilde J_{2,\pm}=J_{2,\pm}\text{ on }B_{2r}^c, & ||\tilde J_{2,\pm}-J_{2,\pm}||<\delta,\\ g_3=g_1\text{ on }B_r, & g_3=g_2\text{ on }B_{2r}^c, & ||g_3-g_2||<\delta.\end{array}$$

We average over the action of $\tilde J_{2,\pm}$ to define: $\tilde g_2:=\frac12\{g_3\mp\tilde J_{2,\pm}^*g_3\}$. Since g_1 and g_2 are (para)-Hermitian metrics, we still have that

$$\tilde g_2=g_1\text{ on }B_r\text{ and }\tilde g_2=g_2\text{ on }B_{2r}^c\,.$$

Since $\tilde J_{2,\pm}$ is close to $J_{2,\pm}$, since $\tilde g_3$ is close to g_2, and since $J_{2,\pm}^*g_2=\pm g_2$, we have that $||\tilde g_2-g_2||<\epsilon$ for $\delta=\delta(\epsilon)$ suitably chosen. Since we can always assume ϵ small, this implies that $\tilde g_2$ is non-degenerate. □

2.5. **Complex and para-complex structures.** Let $J_\pm$ be an almost (para)-complex structure on M. We say that $J_\pm$ is *integrable* and that $(M,J_\pm)$ is a *(para)-complex manifold* if there are coordinates centered at every point of M so that the relations of Equation (2.c) hold at all points of the chart:

$$J_\pm\partial_{x_i}=\partial_{x_{i+\bar m}}\quad\text{and}\quad J_\pm\partial_{x_{i+\bar m}}=\pm\partial_{x_i}\quad\text{for}\quad 1\le i\le\bar m\,.\qquad(2.f)$$

Equivalently, $J_\pm$ is integrable if the *Nijenhuis tensor* $N_{J_\pm}$ vanishes where:

$$N_{J_\pm}(X,Y):=[X,Y]\mp J_\pm[J_\pm X,Y]\mp J_\pm[X,J_\pm Y]\pm[J_\pm X,J_\pm Y]\,.$$

Complex structures and para-complex structures are rigid. The following result is now immediate - there is no need to perturb the structures:

Theorem 2.5. *Let $J_{1,\pm}$ be the germ of a (para)-complex structure near $P_1\in M_1$ and let $J_{2,\pm}$ be a (para)-complex structure on M_2. Then $J_{2,\pm}$ is isomorphic to $J_{1,\pm}$ near P_2.*

2.6. **Hermitian and para-Hermitian structures.** A *(para)-Hermitian structure* is a pair $(g,J_\pm)$ where g is a pseudo-Riemannian metric on M, where $J_\pm$ is an integrable (para)-complex structure on M, and where $J_\pm^*g=\mp g$. The triple $(M,g,J_\pm)$ is said to be a *(para)-Hermitian manifold*; we emphasize that g can be indefinite in the complex setting – necessarily g has neutral signature $(\bar m,\bar m)$ in the para-complex setting. The arguments given to prove Theorem 2.4 now extend to establish the following result; it is not necessary to perturb the (para)-complex structure.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $\epsilon>0$ be given. Let $(M_1,g_1,J_{1,\pm})$ be the germ of a (para)-Hermitian structure near $P_1\in M_1$ of signature (p,q) and let $(M_2,g_2,J_{2,\pm})$ be a (para)-Hermitian structure on M_2 of signature (p,q). There exists a pseudo-Riemannian metric $\tilde g_2$ on M_2 so that $(\tilde g_2,J_{2,\pm})$ is a (para)-Hermitian structure on M_2 which is isomorphic to $(g_1,J_{1,\pm})$ near P_2, so that $\tilde g_2=g_2$ away from P_2, and so that $||\tilde g_2-g_2||<\epsilon$.*

2.7. **(Para)-Kähler geometry.** Let $(M,g,J_\pm)$ be an almost (para)-Hermitian manifold of signature (p,q). Define the vector bundles $\Lambda_\mp^2(M)$ and $S_\mp^2(M)$ and define the *(para)-Kähler form* $\Omega_\pm\in C^\infty(\Lambda_\mp^2(M))$ by setting:

$$\begin{aligned}&S_\mp^2(M):=\{h\in S^2(M):J_\pm^*h=\mp h\},\\&\Lambda_\mp^2(M):=\{\omega\in\Lambda^2(M):J_\pm^*\omega=\mp\omega\},\\&\Omega_\pm(x,y):=g(x,J_\pm y)\in C^\infty(\Lambda_\mp^2(M))\,.\end{aligned}\qquad(2.g)$$

Let ∇ be the Levi-Civita connection of g. One has the following useful result – see, for example, the discussion in [4, 21].

Proposition 2.1. *Let* ∇^g *be the Levi-Civita connection of an almost (para)-Hermitian manifold* $(M,g,J_\pm)$. *The following conditions are equivalent and if any is satisfied, then* $(M,g,J_\pm)$ *is said to be a* (para)-Kähler manifold *and* $(g,J_\pm)$ *is said to be a* (para)-Kähler *structure.*

1. $\nabla^g\Omega_\pm=0$.
2. $\nabla^g J_\pm=0$.
3. $J_\pm$ *is integrable and* $d\Omega_\pm=0$.
4. *For every point* P *of* M, *there exists a coordinate system centered at* P *so that Equation* (2.f) *is satisfied, so that Equation* (2.d) *is satisfied in the complex setting and Equation* (2.e) *is satisfied in the para-complex setting, and so that the first derivatives of the metric vanish at* P.

Theorem 2.7. *Let* $\epsilon>0$ *be given. Let* $(g_1,J_{1,\pm})$ *be the germ of a (para)-Kähler structure near* $P_1\in M_1$ *of signature* (p,q) *and let* $(g_2,J_{2,\pm})$ *be a (para)-Kähler structure of signature* (p,q) *on* M_2. *There exists a pseudo-Riemannian metric* $\tilde g_2$ *on* M_2 *so that* $(\tilde g_2,J_{2,\pm})$ *is a Kähler structure on* M_2, *so that* $(\tilde g_2,J_{2,\pm})$ *is isomorphic to* $(g_1,J_{1,\pm})$ *near* P_2, *so that* $\tilde g_2=g_2$ *away from* P_2, *and so that* $||\tilde g_2-g_2||^1<\epsilon$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.1 (4), we may choose coordinate systems $\vec x$ on M_1 and $\vec y$ on M_2 so that $g_1(P_1)=g_2(P_2)$ under the identification described in Equation (2.e) or Equation (2.d), so that $J_{1,\pm}(P_1)=J_{2,\pm}(P_2)$ under the identification described in Equation (2.f), and so that the first derivatives of the metrics vanish at P_1 and at P_2. (This is, of course, exactly the step which fails in examining the (para)-Hermitian setting and is why we only obtain C^0 norm estimates and not C^1 norm estimates in those cases.) We then have for r sufficiently small that

$$||\Omega_{\pm,g_1}-\Omega_{\pm,g_2}||_{3r}\le Cr^2\text{ and }||\Omega_{\pm,g_1}-\Omega_{\pm,g_2}||_{3r}^1\le Cr\,.$$

Unfortunately, the convex combination of (para)-Kähler metrics is no longer a (para)-Kähler metric so we must proceed a bit differently. We shall exploit a correspondence between $S^2_\mp(M)$ and $\Lambda^2_\mp(M)$. If $h\in C^\infty(S^2_\mp(M))$, then we may define $\omega_{\pm,h}\in C^\infty(\Lambda_\mp(M)$ by setting $\omega_{\pm,h}(x,y):=h(x,J_\pm y)$; h may be recovered from $\omega_{\pm,h}$ since $h(x,y)=\pm\omega_h(x,J_\pm y)$. Instead of finding $\tilde g_2$ directly, we will find $\tilde\omega_\pm\in C^\infty(\Lambda^2_\mp(B_{3r}))$ so that

$$\begin{aligned}&\tilde\omega_\pm=\Omega_{\pm,g_1}\text{ on }B_r,\quad &&\tilde\omega_\pm=\Omega_{\pm,g_2}\text{ on }B^c_{2r},\\ &||\tilde\omega_\pm-\Omega_{\pm,g_2}||^1_{3r}<\epsilon,\quad &&d\tilde\omega_\pm=0\,.\end{aligned}\tag{2.h}$$

We will then set $\tilde g(x,y)=\pm\tilde\omega_\pm(x,J_\pm y)$ and conclude that $(\tilde g_2,J_{2,\pm})$ is a (para)-Hermitian manifold with:

$$\tilde g_2=g_1\text{ on }B_r,\quad \tilde g_2=g_2\text{ on }B^c_{2r},\quad ||\tilde g_2-g_2||^1_{3r}<\epsilon\,.$$

The estimate $||\tilde g_2-g_2||^1_{3r}<\epsilon$ shows that $\tilde g_2$ is non-degenerate. The identity $d\Omega_{\pm,\tilde g_2}=d\tilde\omega_\pm=0$ shows that $(\tilde g_2,J_{2,\pm})$ is (para)-Kähler structure on M_2 and completes the proof. We now proceed with the construction of $\tilde\omega_\pm$. Set:

$$\Delta_\pm:=\Omega_{\pm,g_1}-\Omega_{\pm,g_2}\text{ on }B_{3r}\,.$$

We then have that

$$d\Delta_\pm=d\Omega_{\pm,g_1}-d\Omega_{\pm,g_2}=0,\quad ||\Delta_\pm||^1_{3r}\le Cr,\quad\text{and}\quad ||\Delta_\pm||_{3r}\le Cr^2\,.$$

We first work in the complex setting. Let ∂ and $\bar\partial$ be the *Dolbeault operators.* The Dolbeault cohomology of B_{3r} vanishes so we may find $f_-\in C^\infty(B_{3r})$ so that

$$\Delta_-=\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar\partial f_-\,.$$

The analogue of ∂ and $\bar\partial$ in para-complex geometry are the operators $d_\pm$. But again, we can find a function $f_+\in C^\infty(B_{3r})$ so that

$$\Delta_+=d_+d_-f_+\,.$$

We refer to [7, 20, 21] for further details concerning the *(para)-Kähler potential* $f_\pm$. To have a uniform notation, we set

$$A_+ = d_+, \quad A_- = \sqrt{-1}\partial, \quad B_+ = d_-, \quad B_- = \bar\partial\,.$$

Expand $f_\pm$ and $\Delta_\pm$ in Taylor series about 0 in the form

$$\Delta_\pm \sim \textstyle\sum_\nu \Delta_{\pm,\nu} \quad \text{and} \quad f_\pm \sim \textstyle\sum_\nu f_{\pm,\nu}$$

where $\Delta_{\pm,\nu}$ and $f_{\pm,\nu}$ are polynomials which are homogeneous of degree ν. Since $g_1(0) = g_2(0)$ and $dg_1(0) = dg_2(0) = 0$, we have $\Delta_{\pm,\nu} = 0$ for $\nu = 1, 2$. Equating terms of suitable homogeneity in the expansions $\sum_\mu A_\pm B_\pm\, f_{\pm,\mu} \sim \sum_\nu \Delta_{\pm,\nu}$ yields:

$$\begin{aligned}&A_\pm B_\pm f_{\pm,0} = 0, \quad A_\pm B_\pm f_{\pm,1} = 0, \quad A_\pm B_\pm f_{\pm,2} = \Delta_{\pm,0} = 0,\\ &A_\pm B_\pm f_{\pm,3} = \Delta_{\pm,1} = 0\,.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently we may assume that $f_{\pm,0} = f_{\pm,1} = f_{\pm,2} = f_{\pm,3} = 0$. This implies that there exists a constant C so that if $0 < t < 1$, then we have:

$$||\partial_{x_j}\partial_{x_k} f_\pm||_{3rt} < C \cdot t^2 \text{ and } ||\partial_{x_i}\partial_{x_j}\partial_{x_k} f_\pm||_{3rt} < C_0 t\,.$$

The same technique used to establish Theorem 2.2 permits us to estimate

$$||A_\pm B_\pm \phi_{rt} f_\pm|| \le Ct^2 \text{ and } ||\partial_i A_\pm B_\pm \phi_{rt} f_\pm|| \le Ct\,. \tag{2.i}$$

Set

$$\tilde\omega_\pm := \Omega_{\pm,g_2} + A_\pm B_\pm \phi_{rt} f_\pm\,.$$

We must verify that the relations of Equation (2.h) are satisfied where we replace r by rt. On B_{rt}, we have $\phi_{rt} = 1$. Consequently

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde\omega_\pm|_{B_{rt}} &= \{\Omega_{\pm,g_2} + A_\pm B_\pm \phi_{rt} f_\pm\}|_{B_{rt}} = \{\Omega_{\pm,g_2} + A_\pm B_\pm f_\pm\}|_{B_{rt}}\\ &= \{\Omega_{\pm,g_2} + \Delta_\pm\}|_{B_{rt}} = \{\Omega_{\pm,g_2} + \Omega_{\pm,g_1} - \Omega_{\pm,g_2}\}|_{B_{rt}} = \Omega_{\pm,g_1}|_{B_{rt}}\,.\end{aligned}$$

On B_{2rt}^c we have $\phi_{rt} = 0$. Consequently

$$\tilde\omega_\pm|_{B_{2rt}^c} = \{\Omega_{\pm,g_2} + A_\pm B_\pm \phi_{rt} f_\pm\}|_{B_{2rt}^c} = \{\Omega_{\pm,g_2} + 0\}|_{B_{2rt}^c}\,.$$

The identity $\tilde\omega_\pm = 0$ follows from the fact that $d\bar\partial\partial = 0$ in the complex setting and $dd_+d_- = 0$ in the para-complex setting. The desired estimate for $||\tilde g_2 - g_2||^1$ follows from Equation (2.i). □

2.8. **Weyl structures.** We refer to [4, 16] for background information concerning Weyl geometry. A *Weyl structure* on M is a pair (M, ∇) where g is a pseudo-Riemannian metric on M and where ∇ is a torsion free connection on M so that $\nabla g = -2\omega \otimes g$ for some smooth 1-form ω. These structures were introduced by Weyl [32] in an attempt to unify gravity with electromagnetism. Although this approach failed for physical reasons, these geometries are still studied for their intrinsic interest. This is a conformal theory. If $\tilde g = e^{2f} g$ is a conformally equivalent metric, then $(M, \tilde g, \nabla)$ also is a Weyl structure where the associated 1-form is given by setting $\tilde\omega = \omega + 2df$. The triple (M, g, ∇) is called a *Weyl manifold* and (g, ∇) is said to give M a *Weyl structure.*

Theorem 2.8. *Let (g_1, ∇_1) be the germ of an Weyl structure of signature (p, q) at $P_1 \in M_1$ and let (g_2, ∇_2) be a Weyl structure of signature (p, q) on M_2. There exists a Weyl structure $(\tilde g_2, \nabla_2)$ on M_2 so that $(\tilde g_2, \tilde\nabla_2)$ is equal to (g_2, ∇_2) away from P_2 and so that $(\tilde g_2, \tilde\nabla_2)$ is isomorphic to (g_1, ∇_1) near P_2.*

Remark 2.1. It is not possible to choose $(\tilde g_2, \tilde\nabla_2)$ so that both of the following estimates hold:

$$||g_2 - \tilde g_2||_{3r} < \epsilon \text{ and } ||\nabla_2 - \tilde\nabla_2||_{3r} < \epsilon\,.$$

The associated 1 forms ω_i defined by the identity $\nabla_i g_i = \omega_i \otimes g_i$ are invariants of the theory. If we assume $g_1(P_1) = g_2(P_2)$, then

$$g_2(P_2)(\omega_1 - \omega_2, \omega_1 - \omega_2) = g_2(P_2)(\tilde\omega_2 - \omega_2, \tilde\omega_2 - \omega_2)$$

is an invariant which can in general be made arbitrarily small.

Proof. We replace B_{3r} by B_{5r} and use the construction used to prove Theorem 2.2 to choose a pseudo-Riemannian metric g_2 on M_2 and so that $\tilde g_2 = g_1$ on B_{2r} so that $\tilde g_2 = g_2$ on B_{3r}^c. We generalize the argument of Section 2.1 to this setting. Let $\{\psi_1, \psi_2, \psi_3\}$ be a partition of unity on M which is subordinate to the cover $\{B_{2r}, B_{4r} \cap B_r^c, B_{3r}^c\}$. Let $\nabla_{\tilde g_2}$ be the Levi-Civita connection of $\tilde g_2$. Form:

$$\tilde\nabla_2 = \psi_1 \nabla_1 + \psi_2 \nabla_{\tilde g_2} + \psi_3 \nabla_2 \,.$$

The convex combination of Weyl connections for a metric g is again a Weyl connection for that metric. We argue:

1. On B_{2r}, we have $\psi_3 = 0$ and $\tilde g_2 = g_1$ so $\tilde\nabla_2 = \psi_1\nabla_1 + \psi_2\nabla_{\tilde g_2}$ is a Weyl connection for $\tilde g_2 = g_1$.
2. On $B_{2r}^c \cap B_{3r}$, we have $\psi_1 = 0$, $\psi_3 = 0$, and $\psi_2 = 1$ so $\tilde\nabla_2 = \nabla_{\tilde g_2}$ is a Weyl connection for $\tilde g_2$.
3. On B_{3r}^c, we have $\tilde g_2 = g_2$ and $\psi_1 = 0$ so $\tilde\nabla_2 = \psi_2\nabla_{\tilde g_2} + \psi_3\nabla_2$ is a Weyl connection for $\tilde g_2 = g_2$.

Note that we do not have the ϵ condition as $\tilde\nabla_2$ need not be close to ∇_2 at P_2. □

2.9. **(para)-Kähler–Weyl structures.** A quadruple $(M, g, J_\pm, \nabla)$ is said to be a *(para)-Kähler–Weyl structure* if $(M, g, J_\pm)$ is a (para)-Hermitian manifold, if (M, g, ∇) is a Weyl structure, and if $\nabla J_\pm = 0$; the triple $(g, J_\pm, \nabla)$ is said to give M a *(para)-Kähler–Weyl structure.*

Theorem 2.9. *Let $(g_1, J_{1,\pm}, \nabla_1)$ be the germ of a (para)-Kähler–Weyl structure of signature (p, q) at $P_1 \in M_1$ and let $(g_2, J_{2,\pm}, \nabla_2)$ be a (para)-Kähler–Weyl structure of signature (p, q) on M_2. There exists $(\tilde g_2, \tilde\nabla_2)$ so that $(\tilde g_2, J_{2,\pm}, \tilde\nabla_2)$ is (para)-Kähler–Weyl structure on M_2 with $(\tilde g_2, \tilde\nabla_2)$ equal to (g_2, ∇_2) away from P_2, and so that $(\tilde g_2, \tilde J_{2,\pm}, \tilde\nabla_2)$ isomorphic to $(g_1, J_{1,\pm}, \nabla_1)$ near P_2.*

Proof. We apply the analysis of [15] and divide the analysis into 2 cases.. We first suppose that $m \geq 6$. Let $i = 1, 2$. Then near P_i we have that $g_i = e^{2\Phi_i} h_i$ is conformally equivalent to a Kähler metric h_i on $(B_{3r}, J_{i,\pm})$ with $\nabla_i = \nabla^{h_i}$ being the Levi-Civita connection of h_i. We apply argument used to prove Theorem 2.7 to construct a Kähler metric $\tilde h_2$ on B_{3r} so that $\tilde h_2 = h_1$ on B_r and so that $\tilde h_2 = h_2$ on B_{2r}^c. We set $\tilde\nabla_2 = \nabla^{\tilde h_2}$. Then $\tilde\nabla_2 = \nabla_1$ on B_r and $\tilde\nabla_2 = \nabla_2$ on B_{2r}^c; consequently, $\tilde\nabla_2$ is globally defined and we have that $\tilde\nabla_2 J_{2,\pm} = 0$. However, we can no longer conclude that $||\tilde\nabla_2 - \nabla_2|| < \epsilon$ since we have not controlled the first derivatives of $\tilde h_2 - h_2$ on B_{3r}. We smooth out the conformal factor setting

$$\Phi := \phi_r \Phi_1 + (1 - \phi_r)\Phi_2 \text{ and } \tilde g_2 = e^{2\Phi}\tilde h_2 \,.$$

We then have $\tilde g_2 = g_1$ on B_r and $\tilde g_2 = g_2$ on B_{2r}^c. As $(\tilde g_2, J_{2,\pm}, \tilde\nabla_2) = (g_2, J_{2,\pm}, \nabla_2)$ on B_{2r}^c, $(\tilde g_2, J_{2,\pm}, \tilde\nabla_2)$ is a (para)-Kähler–Weyl structure on B_{2r}^c. Since $\tilde\nabla_2$ is the Levi-Civita connection of the Kähler metric $\tilde h_2$ on B_{2r}, $(\tilde h_2, J_{2,\pm}, \tilde\nabla_2)$ is a (para)-Kähler–Weyl structure on B_{2r}. Since $\tilde g_2$ is conformally equivalent to $\tilde h_2$, it follows that $(\tilde g_2, J_{2,\pm}, \tilde\nabla_2)$ is (para)-Kähler–Weyl structure on B_{2r} as well. This completes the proof if $m \geq 6$.

In dimension $m = 4$, every (para)-Hermitian manifold $(M, g, J_\pm)$ admits a unique (para)-Kähler structure where the associated 1-form is given by the anti-Lee form $\pm\frac{1}{2}J^*\delta\Omega_\pm$. The desired result now follows from Theorem 2.6; again, we lose control on $||\tilde{\nabla}_2 - \nabla_2||$ since we have not controlled the norms of the first derivatives of $\tilde{g}_2 - g_2$. $\square$

2.10. **Geodesic completeness.** In Riemannian geometry, compact manifolds are necessarily geodesically complete. This is not the case in the higher signature setting. For example, Misner [28] showed that the metric

$$ds^2 := \cos(x)(dy \circ dy - dx \circ dx) + 2\sin(x) dx \circ dy$$

on the 2-dimensional torus is geodesically incomplete. Similarly, Meneghini [27] showed the metric

$$ds^2 := du \circ dv/(u^2 + v^2) \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^2 - \{(0,0)\}$$

is geodesically incomplete; this may be compactified by identifying (u, v) with $(2u, 2v)$ to obtain a geodesically incomplete metric on the 2-torus. Finally, taking ${\Gamma_{11}}^1 = 1$ on the circle yields a geodesically incomplete affine manifold. Thus the following transplantation result does not follow from Theorem 1.1:

Theorem 2.10. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given.*

1. *Let ∇_1 be the germ of a torsion free connection at $P_1 \in M_1$ and let ∇_2 be the usual flat connection on $\mathbb{R}^m$. There exists a torsion free connection $\tilde{\nabla}_2$ on $\mathbb{R}^m$ which is isomorphic to ∇_1 on B_ϵ, which agrees with ∇_2 on $B^c_{2\epsilon}$, which satisfies the estimate $||\tilde{\nabla}_2 - \nabla_2|| < \epsilon$, and which is geodesically complete.*
2. *Let g_1 be the germ of a pseudo-Riemannian metric of signature (p, q) at $P_1 \in M_1$ and let g_2 be a flat pseudo-Riemannian metric of signature (p, q) on $\mathbb{R}^m$. There exists a pseudo-Riemannian metric $\tilde{g}_2$ on $\mathbb{R}^m$ which is isomorphic to g_1 on B_ϵ, which agrees with g_2 on $B^c_{2\epsilon}$, which satisfies the estimate $||\tilde{g}_2 - g_2||^1 < \epsilon$, and which is geodesically complete.*
3. *Let $(g_1, J_{1,\pm})$ be the germ of a (para)-Kähler structure near $P_1 \in M_1$ of signature (p, q). Let $(g_2, J_{2,\pm})$ be a flat (para)-Kähler structure on $\mathbb{R}^m$ of signature (p, q). There exists pseudo-Riemannian metric $\tilde{g}_2$ on $\mathbb{R}^m$ so that $(\tilde{g}_2, J_{2,\pm})$ is a Kähler structure, so that $(g_1, J_{1,\pm})$ is isomorphic to $(\tilde{g}_2, J_{2,\pm})$ on B_ϵ, so that $\tilde{g}_2$ agrees with g_2 on $B^c_{2\epsilon}$, so that $\tilde{g}_2$ satisfies the estimate $||\tilde{g}_2 - g_2||^1 < \epsilon$, and so that $\tilde{g}_2$ is geodesically complete.*

Theorem 2.10 will follow from the C^0 estimate of Theorem 2.1, from the C^1 estimate of Theorem 2.2, from the C^1 estimate of Theorem 2.7, and from the following result:

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given with $\epsilon < \epsilon(m)$ sufficiently small. Let ∇_2 be the flat connection on $\mathbb{R}^m$. If $\tilde{\nabla}_2$ is a torsion free connection on $\mathbb{R}^m$ with $\tilde{\nabla}_2 = \nabla_2$ on B^c_ϵ and $||\tilde{\nabla}_2 - \nabla_2|| < \epsilon$, then $\tilde{\nabla}_2$ is geodesically complete.*

Proof. Let γ be a geodesic for $\tilde{\nabla}_2$. If γ never enters B_ϵ, then γ is a straight line and continues for infinite time. Suppose $\gamma(0) \in B_\epsilon$; we can assume without loss of generality that $|\dot{\gamma}(0)| = 1$ relative to the usual Euclidean metric on $\mathbb{R}^m$. We examine the situation for $t > 0$ as the situation for $t < 0$ is analogous. Assume γ does not extend for infinite time and let $[0, T)$ be a maximal domain. If γ exits from B_ϵ, then it continues as a straight line for infinite time and consequently γ is trapped inside B_ϵ. Let $\dot{\gamma} := \partial_t \gamma$ and $\ddot{\gamma} := \partial_t^2 \gamma$. By compactness, there is a uniform δ so if $|\dot{\gamma}(t)| \le 2$, then γ extends to $[t, t + \delta)$. Consequently $|\dot{\gamma}(t_0)| > 2$ for some $t_0 \in [0, T)$. Choose t_0 minimal so $|\dot{\gamma}(t_0)| = 2$ and thus $|\dot{\gamma}| \le 2$ on $[0, t_0]$. The geodesic equation $\ddot{\gamma} + \Gamma(\dot{\gamma}, \dot{\gamma}) = 0$ yields the estimate

$$|\ddot{\gamma}(t)| \le C_m |\Gamma| \cdot |\dot{\gamma}(t)|^2 \le C_m \cdot \epsilon \cdot 4\,.$$

Consequently, if ϵ is small, we may conclude that $|\ddot{\gamma}|$ is small. Since $|\dot{\gamma}| \ge 2$ and since $\dot{\gamma}$ is changing rather slowly, this implies t_0 must be relative large; in particular, for very small ϵ, we must have $t_0 \geq 3$. Again, as $\dot\gamma$ is changing slowly, we have $\dot\gamma(t)-\dot\gamma(0)$ must be small. In particular,

$$(\dot\gamma(t),\dot\gamma(0)) \geq \tfrac{1}{2}(\dot\gamma(0),\dot\gamma(0)) \geq \tfrac{1}{2}\,.$$

Consequently $(\gamma(t),\dot\gamma(0)) \geq \frac{1}{2}t$. Taking $t_0 = 3$ then implies $|\gamma(t_0)| \geq \frac{3}{2}$ and hence, contrary to our assumption, γ has exited from B_ϵ. This contradiction establishes the Lemma. □

3. Universal curvature identities

In this section, we use Theorem 1.2 to answer certain questions that were raised previously in [13, 26].

3.1. **The identity of Berger.** The generalized Gauss-Bonnet theorem expresses a topological invariant (the Euler characteristic) as an integral of an expression in curvature (the Euler form) in the category of compact Riemannian manifolds. Berger [1] used the associated Euler-Lagrange equations to derive a curvature identity on any 4-dimensional compact oriented Riemannian manifold. Let $\check R$, $\check\rho$, and $L\rho$ be the symmetric 2-tensors whose components are given by:

$$\check R_{ij} = \sum_{a,b,c} R_{abci}R^{abc}{}_j, \quad \check\rho_{ij} = \sum_a \rho_{ai}\rho^a{}_j, \quad (L\rho)_{ij} = 2\sum_{a,b} R_{iabj}\rho^{ab}.$$

The identity of Berger is quadratic in the curvature; it may be stated as follows:

$$\tfrac{1}{4}(|R|^2 - 4|\rho|^2 + \tau^2)g - \check R + 2\check\rho + L\rho - \tau\rho = 0. \tag{3.a}$$

Euh, Park, and Sekigawa [10, 11, 12] gave a direct proof that Equation (3.a) holds more generally in the non-compact setting and provided some applications of the identity. There is a higher dimensional generalization found by Kuz'mina [22] and subsequently established using different method by Labbi [23, 24, 25]. Gilkey, Park, and Sekigawa [17] gave a different proof of this higher dimensional generalization using heat trace method based on Weyl's invariance theory [31]. We also refer to related work of Euh, Jeong, and Park [9]. It follows from Theorem 1.2 that any such identity which holds in the compact setting automatically extends to the non-compact setting thus answering directly a question originally posed in [13, 26].

3.2. **Almost Hermitian geometry.** Work of Gray [18] and of Tricerri and Vanhecke [30] establishes several curvature identities in the context of almost Hermitian geometry. The defining equations of Ricci $*$-tensor and the $*$-scalar curvature are examples of such identities. Blair [2] discussed a similar problem for almost contact metric manifolds. Gray and Hervella [19] examined identities related to the Kähler form Ω. We shall present an application of Theorem 1.2 in this setting. Let $\rho^* = (\rho^*_{ij})$ and $\tau^* = g^{ij}\rho^*_{ij}$ be the Ricci $*$-tensor and the $*$-scalar curvature of M, respectively. The following identity holds on any 4-dimensional almost Hermitian manifold (M,g,J) [18, 19]:

$$\rho^*_{ij} + \rho^*_{ji} - \rho_{ij} - J_i{}^a J_j{}^b \rho_{ab} - \tfrac{\tau^*-\tau}{2} g_{ij} = 0. \tag{3.b}$$

It is easily checked that the equality in Equation (3.b) is trivial in the case where M is Kähler since the following identity holds on any Kähler manifold:

$$R_{ijkl} = R_{ijab}J_k{}^a J_l{}^b\,.$$

Let $M = (M,g,J)$ be a 4-dimensional compact almost Hermitian manifold; we replace J_- by J to avoid unnecessary notational complexities. Let $\chi(M)$, $p_1(M)$ and $c_1^2(M)$ be the Euler number of M, the first Pontrjagin number of M, and the evaluation of the square of the first Chern form on M, respectively. Then Wu's Theorem [33] yields the relationship:

$$c_1^2(M)=2\chi(M)+p_1(M)\,. \tag{3.c}$$

Euh, Park, and Sekigawa [13] derived the following curvature identities on M from the integral formula for the first Pontrjagin number using Novikov's theorem [29] provided that the underlying manifold M in question was compact:

$$T_{ij}=T_{ab}J_i{}^aJ_j{}^b,\quad S_{ij}=S_{ab}J_i{}^aJ_j{}^b,\quad T_{ib}J_j{}^b+S_{ij}=0\,. \tag{3.d}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
&T_{ij}:=\tfrac{1}{2}\big(T'_{ij}+T'_{ji}\big),\quad S_{ij}:=\tfrac{1}{2}\big(S'_{ij}-S'_{ji}\big),\\
&T'_{ij}:=2\big(\rho^{*a}{}_j\rho^*_{ai}-\rho^*_{ja}\rho^*{}_i{}^a+\rho^{*ab}R_{auvi}J_b{}^uJ_j{}^v\\
&\quad+2\nabla_b\nabla_a(\rho^{*ac}J_i{}^bJ_{cj})+\tfrac{1}{2}\rho^{*ab}\rho^*_{ab}g_{ij}\big)\\
&\quad 4J_j{}^aJ^{ub}R_{abk}{}^lR_{iul}{}^k+4\nabla_b\nabla_a(J_u{}^aJ_{vi}R^{uv}{}_j{}^b)\\
&\quad+\tfrac{1}{2}(J^{ua}J^{vb}R_{abk}{}^lR_{uvl}{}^k)g_{ij},
\end{aligned}$$

$$S'_{ij}:=2\rho^{*ab}(2J_{bj}\rho^*_{ai}-J_b{}^cJ_i{}^uJ_j{}^vR_{acuv})-2(J^{ua}R_{jak}{}^lR_{iul}{}^k).$$

Since $\chi(M)$ and $p_1(M)$ are topological invariants, Equation (3.c) shows that $c_1^2(M)$ also is a topological invariant. Using this observation, Lee, Park, and Sekigawa [26] derived the following curvature identities on M from the integral formula for $c_1^2(M)$ in terms of curvature provided that the underlying manifold M in question was compact:

$$U_{ij}=U_{ab}J_i{}^aJ_j{}^b,\quad V_{ij}=V_{ab}J_i{}^aJ_j{}^b,\quad U_{ib}J_j{}^b+V_{ij}=0 \tag{3.e}$$

where

$$U^{ij}:=\tfrac{1}{2}(U'^{ij}+U'^{ji}),\ V_{ij}:=g_{ip}g_{jq}V^{pq},\ V^{pq}=\tfrac{1}{2}(V'^{pq}-V'^{qp}),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&U'^{ij}:=J^{iv}\rho^{*}_v{}^{w}(\nabla_wJ_a{}^b)(\nabla^jJ_u{}^a)J_b{}^u+J^{wi}\rho^{*jc}(\nabla_cJ_a{}^b)(\nabla_wJ_u{}^a)J_b{}^u\\
&\quad+4\nabla_u(J^{cv}\rho^{*}_v{}^{i}(\nabla_cJ^{ju}))+\tfrac{1}{2}J^{cv}R_{vws}{}^iJ^{dw}J^{sj}(\nabla_dJ_a{}^b)(\nabla_cJ_u{}^a)J_b{}^u\\
&\quad-\nabla_s\nabla_c(J^{dj}J^{si}J_k{}^c(\nabla^kJ_a{}^b)(\nabla_dJ_u{}^a)J_b{}^u)-3J^{cv}\rho^{*}_v{}^{d}(\nabla_dJ_a{}^i)(\nabla_cJ^{jw})J_w{}^a\\
&\quad-\tfrac{1}{2}J^{cv}\rho^{*}_v{}^{d}(\nabla_dJ_a{}^b)(\nabla_cJ_u{}^a)J_b{}^ug^{ij}-\tfrac{1}{2}\rho^{*ij}(\nabla_cJ_a{}^b)(\nabla_uJ_v{}^a)J_b{}^vJ^{cu}\\
&\quad+\tfrac{1}{2}\nabla_l\nabla_k(J^{ik}J^{jl}(\nabla_cJ_a{}^b)(\nabla_uJ_v{}^a)J_b{}^vJ^{cu})+2\nabla_c(\tau^*(\nabla_uJ^{jc})J^{iu})\\
&\quad+\tfrac{3}{2}\tau^*(\nabla_cJ^{jb})(\nabla_uJ_v{}^i)J_b{}^vJ^{cu}+\tau^*(\nabla^jJ_a{}^b)(\nabla_uJ_v{}^a)J_b{}^vJ^{iu}\\
&\quad-\tfrac{1}{4}\tau^*(\nabla_cJ_a{}^b)(\nabla_uJ_v{}^a)J_b{}^vJ^{cu}g^{ij}+2\rho^*_{lk}R^k{}_{ab}{}^iJ^{la}J^{bj}\\
&\quad+4\nabla_a\nabla^l(\rho^*_{kl}J^{ai}J^{kj})-\rho^{*ab}\rho^*_{ba}g^{ij}+2\tau^*\rho^{*ij}\\
&\quad-2\nabla_b\nabla_a(\tau^*J^{ia}J^{jb})+\tfrac{1}{2}(\tau^*)^2g^{ij}\ \text{ and}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&V'^{pq}:=-J^{jv}J^{iq}\rho^{*}_v{}^{p}(\nabla_iJ_a{}^b)(\nabla_jJ_u{}^a)J_b{}^u\\
&\quad+\tfrac{1}{2}J^{jv}J^{iw}J^{pc}J^{qd}R_{vwcd}(\nabla_iJ_a{}^b)(\nabla_jJ_u{}^a)J_b{}^u\\
&\quad-2\nabla_i(J^{jv}\rho^{*}_v{}^{i}(\nabla_jJ_w{}^p)J^{qw})+\rho^{*qi}(\nabla_iJ_a{}^b)(\nabla^pJ_u{}^a)J_b{}^u\\
&\quad+J^{jv}\rho^{*}_v{}^{i}(\nabla_iJ_a{}^p)(\nabla_jJ^{qa})\\
&\quad+J^{ip}\rho^{*}_i{}^{q}(\nabla_cJ_a{}^b)(\nabla_uJ_v{}^a)J_b{}^vJ^{cu}+\tfrac{1}{2}\tau^*(\nabla_cJ_a{}^p)(\nabla_uJ^{qa})J^{cu}\\
&\quad+\tfrac{1}{2}\tau^*(\nabla^pJ_a{}^b)(\nabla^qJ_v{}^a)J_b{}^v-\nabla_u(\tau^*(\nabla_cJ^{qb})J_b{}^pJ^{cu})-4J^{lq}\rho^*_{lk}\rho^{*kp}\\
&\quad+2\rho^*_{lk}J^{lc}J^{pa}J^{qb}R^k{}_{cab}-4\tau^*J^{ap}\rho^{*}_a{}^{q}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, from the Theorem 1.2, it follows that Equations (3.d) and (3.e) also hold on any 4-dimensional almost Hermitian manifold which is not necessarily compact. This answers affirmatively questions posed in [13, 26]. In particular, if $M = (M, g, J)$ is a 4-dimensional Kähler manifold one has the following curvature identities [13, 26]:

$$2\check{\rho} - \tau\rho - \tfrac{1}{2}\Big(|\rho|^2 - \tfrac{\tau^2}{2}\Big)g = 0, \text{ and } 2L\rho - 8\check{\rho} + 2\tau\rho + \tfrac{1}{2}\Big(2|\rho|^2 - \tau^2\Big)g = 0.$$

4. Realizing curvature tensors

In this section, we present two examples to illustrate the use of Theorem 1.3 to solve problems involving geometric realizability. In Section 4.1, we study pseudo-Riemannian curvature models and in Section 4.2, we study para-Kähler curvature models. We emphasize that each of the contexts we have examined have results of a similar nature but we have limited ourselves to these two examples in the interests of brevity; in particular, the Kähler setting is completely analogous.

4.1. **Riemannian curvature models.** The Riemann curvature tensor satisfies the following symmetries

$$\begin{aligned} &A(x,y,z,w) + A(y,x,z,w) = 0,\\ &A(x,y,z,w) + A(y,z,x,w) + A(z,x,y,w) = 0,\\ &A(x,y,z,w) + A(x,y,w,z) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.a}$$

We say that a triple $(V, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle, A)$ is a *pseudo-Riemannian curvature model* of signature (p,q) if $(V, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$ is an inner product space of signature (p,q) and if $A \in \otimes^4 V^*$ satisfies the universal curvature symmetries given above. We say that two such models $(V_i, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_i, A_i)$ are *isomorphic* if there is a linear map ϕ from V_1 to V_2 so that $\phi^* A_2 = A_1$ and so that $\phi^*\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_2 = \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_1$. The following theorem shows that the universal symmetries given in Equation (4.a) generate all the curvature symmetries. There are no additional "hidden" symmetries and any other universal identity is an algebraic consequence of these identities:

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\mathfrak{M} = (V, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle, A)$ be a pseudo-Riemannian curvature model of signature (p,q). Let P be a point of a pseudo-Riemannian manifold (M,g) of signature (p,q). Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. There exists a pseudo-Riemannian metric $\tilde{g}$ on M so that $g = \tilde{g}$ away from P and so that (T_PM, g_P, R_P) is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{M}$.*

Proof. Fix a basis $\{e_i\}$ for V. Let

$$\varepsilon_{ij} := \langle e_i, e_j\rangle \text{ and } A_{ijkl} := A(e_i, e_j, e_k, e_l)$$

give the structure constants of the model. Define:

$$g_{ik} := \varepsilon_{ik} - \tfrac{1}{3}A_{ijlk}x^j x^l\,.$$

Since ε is non-degenerate with signature (p,q), this is the germ of a pseudo-Riemannian metric on $(V, 0)$. One uses the curvature symmetries to compute $R_{ijkl}(0) = A_{ijkl}$ (see the discussion in [4] for example). We then use Theorem 2.2 to transplant this structure into M. □

4.2. **Para-Kähler curvature models.** If (M, g, J_+) is a para-Kähler manifold, then the curvature tensor satisfies an additional symmetry

$$R(x,y,z,w) = -R(x,y,J_+z,J_+w)\,. \tag{4.b}$$

We say that a quadruple $(V, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle, J_+, A)$ is a *para-Kähler curvature model* of signature (p,q) if $(V, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$ is an inner product space of signature (p,q) with a para-complex structure J_+ such that $J_+^*\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle = -\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$, and if $A \in \otimes^4 V^*$ satisfies the symmetries of Equation (4.a) and Equation (4.b). The following theorem shows that the universal symmetries given in Equation (4.a) and in Equation (4.b) generate all the curvature symmetries in the para-Kähler setting. As in the pseudo-Riemannian setting, there are no additional "hidden" symmetries and any other universal identity is an algebraic consequence of these identities:

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\mathfrak{M} = (V, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle, J_+, A)$ be a para-Kähler curvature model of signature (p, q). Let P be a point of a para-Kähler manifold (M, g, J_+) of signature (p, q). There exists a para-Kähler metric $\tilde{g}$ on (M, J_+) so that $\tilde{g} = g$ away from P and so that (T_PM, g_P, J_+, R_P) is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{M}$.*

Proof. We follow the treatment in [14] to construct the germ of a suitable structure and refer to [5, 6] for a different treatment. We will then use Theorem 2.7 to transplant this structure into M. To simplify the notation, we assume that $m = 4$; the general case is then easily handled. We adopt the notation of Equation (2.g) on the algebraic level; $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle \in S^2_-(V)$. Choose a basis $\{e_i\}$ for V and let $\varepsilon_{ij} = \langle e_i, e_j\rangle$. Extend J_+ to an integrable para-complex structure on $T(V)$ by identifying the tangent bundle $T(V)$ with the trivial bundle $V \times V$ over V:

$$\begin{array}{llll} J_+\partial_{x_1} = \partial_{x_1}, & J_+\partial_{x_2} = \partial_{x_2}, & J_+\partial_{x_3} = -\partial_{x_3}, & J_+\partial_{x_4} = -\partial_{x_4}, \\ J_+^*dx^1 = dx^1, & J_+^*dx^2 = dx^2, & J_+^*dx^3 = -dx^3, & J_+^*dx^4 = -dx^4 . \end{array}$$

Let $\theta \in S^2_- \otimes S^2$. Set:

$$g_\theta = (\varepsilon_{ij} + \theta_{ijkl}x^kx^l)dx^i \circ dx^j .$$

Since $g_\theta(0) = \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$, g_θ is non-degenerate near 0 and defines the germ of a pseudo-Riemannian metric at $0 \in V$. Since $\theta \in S^2_- \otimes S^2$ and since $J_+^*\varepsilon = -\varepsilon$, $J^*g_\theta = -g_\theta$. Thus (g_θ, J_+) defines the germ of a para-Hermitian manifold. Set:

$$\mathcal{K}_+(\theta)(x, y, z) := 2\{\theta(x, J_+y, z, e_l) + \theta(y, J_+z, x, e_l) + \theta(z, J_+x, y, e_l)\}x^l .$$

It then an easy calculation to show that the exterior derivative of the Kähler form is given by

$$d\Omega_+^{g_\theta}(x, y, z) = 2\mathcal{K}_+(\theta)(x, y, z) .$$

Let $\mathfrak{K}_+ := \ker(\mathcal{K}_+) \cap S^2_- \otimes S^2$. It is then immediate that if $\theta \in \mathfrak{K}_+$, then g_θ is a para-Kähler metric. Let $\mathcal{R}(\theta)$ be the curvature tensor of the Levi-Civita connection of g_θ at 0. It is an easy calculation to verify

$$\mathcal{R}(\theta)(x, y, z, w) = \theta(x, z, y, w) + \theta(y, w, x, z) - \theta(x, w, y, z) - \theta(y, z, x, w) . \quad (4.c)$$

Let $\mathfrak{K}_{+,R} \subset \otimes^4V^*$ be the set of all tensors satisfying the symmetries of Equation (4.a) and Equation (4.b). We will show that every para-Kähler curvature model of signature (p, q) can be realized by the germ of a Kähler structure of signature (p, q) by showing that

$$\mathcal{R} : \mathfrak{K}_+ \to \mathfrak{K}_{+,R} \to 0 .$$

The Riemann curvature tensor also satisfies $R(x, y, z, w) = R(z, w, x, y)$. Thus by Theorem 4.1, this symmetry is an algebraic consequence of the other symmetries in Equation (4.a); this can also, of course, be verified combinatorially – see, for example, the discussion in [3]. This permits us to regard $R \in S^2(\Lambda^2(V^*))$. Set $\xi^{ijkl} := dx^i \wedge dx^j \wedge dx^k \wedge dx^l$. We use Equation (4.b) to see $\mathfrak{K}_{+,R} \subset S^2(\Lambda^2_+)$. After taking into account the Bianchi identity, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{K}_{+,\mathfrak{R}} \subset \operatorname{Span}\{&\xi^{1313},\ \xi^{1414},\ \xi^{2323},\ \xi^{2424},\ \xi^{1323},\ \xi^{1424},\ \xi^{1314},\ \xi^{2324}, \\ &\xi^{1324} + \xi^{1423}\} . \end{aligned}$$

There are 9 elements in this basis; this is in accordance with the dimension count given by [4] in the para-complex setting.

We consider the following example. Let

$$\langle\partial_{x_1},\partial_{x_3}\rangle=\langle\partial_{x_2},\partial_{x_4}\rangle=1\text{ and }\theta=\tfrac{1}{2}(dx^1\circ dx^3)\otimes(dx^1\circ dx^3)\in S^2_-\otimes S^2\,;$$

g_θ is a para-Kähler metric which takes the form $M_1\times M_2$ where M_1 is a para-Riemann surface and where M_2 is flat; we can also verify directly that the para-Kähler form vanishes since $\mathcal{K}_+(\theta)$ is a 3-form which is supported on $\operatorname{Span}\{\partial_{x_1},\partial_{x_3}\}$. Furthermore, we use Equation (4.c) to see

$$\mathcal{R}(\theta)=\xi^{1313}\in\operatorname{Range}(\mathcal{K}_+)\,. \tag{4.d}$$

There is an algebra acting which will be central to our treatment. Let

$$\operatorname{End}_+=\{T\in\operatorname{End}(V):TJ_+=J_+T\}\,.$$

The vector spaces $\mathfrak{K}_{+,R}$ and $\mathfrak{K}_+$ are modules over End_+ and $\mathcal{R}:\mathfrak{K}_+\to\mathfrak{K}_{+,R}$ is an End_+ module morphism. Define $T\in\operatorname{End}_+$ by setting:

$$T(dx^1)=dx^1+a\,dx^2,\quad T(dx^2)=dx^2,\quad T(dx^3)=dx^3+\tilde a\,dx^4,\quad T(dx^4)=\xi^4$$

where $a,\tilde a\in\mathbb{R}$. We apply T to the element of Equation (4.d) to conclude

$$\begin{aligned}T(\xi^{1313})=&\ \xi^{1313}+2a\xi^{1323}+2\tilde a\xi^{1314}+a^2\xi^{2323}+\tilde a^2\xi^{1414}+2a\tilde a(\xi^{1324}+\xi^{1423})\\&+2a^2\tilde a\xi^{2324}+2a\tilde a^2\xi^{1424}+2a^2\tilde a^2\xi^{2424}\in\operatorname{Range}\{\mathcal{K}_+\}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{4.e}$$

Let $\tilde a=\pm a$. Since $\xi^{1313}\in\operatorname{Range}\{\mathcal{K}_\pm\}$, we have

$$2a\xi^{2313}\pm2a\xi^{1314}+O(a^2)\in\operatorname{Range}\{\mathcal{K}_+\}$$

so after dividing by a, we have:

$$\xi^{2313}+O(a)\in\operatorname{Range}\{\mathcal{K}_+\}\text{ and }\xi^{1314}+O(a)\in\operatorname{Range}\{\mathcal{K}_+\}\,.$$

Since $\operatorname{Range}\{\mathcal{K}_+\}$ is a linear subspace of a finite dimensional vector space, it is closed. Thus we may take the limit as $a\to0$ to conclude

$$\xi^{1323}\in\operatorname{Range}\{\mathcal{K}_+\}\text{ and }\xi^{1314}\in\operatorname{Range}\{\mathcal{K}_+\}\,.$$

Permuting the indices $1\leftrightarrow2$ and $3\leftrightarrow4$ defines an element of $\operatorname{End}_\pm$ and shows

$$\xi^{2424}\in\operatorname{Range}\{\mathcal{K}_\pm\},\quad\xi^{1424}\in\operatorname{Range}\{\mathcal{K}_\pm\},\quad\xi^{2324}\in\operatorname{Range}\{\mathcal{K}_\pm\}\,.$$

Since $\{a,\tilde a\}$ are arbitrary, it follows easily that

$$\begin{aligned}&\{\xi^{1313},\ \xi^{1414},\ \xi^{2323},\ \xi^{2424},\ \xi^{1323},\ \xi^{1424},\ \xi^{1314},\ \xi^{2324},\\&\ \ \xi^{1324}+\xi^{1423}\}\subset\operatorname{Range}\{\mathcal{R}\}\,.\end{aligned}$$

This shows that it is possible to geometrically realize every para-Kähler curvature model of signature (p,q) as the germ of a para-Kähler manifold of signature (p,q). Theorem 4.2 now follows from Theorem 2.7. □

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korea government (MEST) (2012-0005282). It was also supported by project MTM2009-07756 (Spain). This article is dedicated to the memory of our friend and colleague E. Merino - may he rest in peace.

REFERENCES

[1] M. Berger, "Quelques formules de variation pour une structure riemannienne", *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. 4^e Serie 3* (1970), 285–294.

[2] D. E. Blair, "Riemannian geometry of contact and symplectic manifolds", *Progress in Math.* **203**, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002).

[3] N. N. Blažić, P. Gilkey, S. Nikčević, and U. Simon, "Algebraic theory of affine curvature tensors", *Arch. Math. (Brno)* **42** (2006), suppl., 147–168.

[4] M. Brozos-Vázquez, P. Gilkey, and S. Nikčević, *Geometric realizations of curvature*, Imperial College Press (2012).

[5] M. Brozos-Vázquez, P. Gilkey, and E. Merino, "Geometric realizations of Kähler and of para-Kähler curvature models", *J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys* **7** (2010), 505–515.

[6] M. Brozos-Vázquez, P. Gilkey, S. Nikčević, and R. Vázquez-Lorenzo, "Geometric realizations of para-Hermitian curvature models", *Results in Mathematics* **56** (2009), 319–333.

[7] V. Cortés, C. Mayer, T. Mohaupt, and F. Saueressig, "Special geometry of Euclidean supersymmetry. I. Vector multiplets", *J. High Energy Phys.* 2004, no. 3, 028.

[8] V. Cruceanu, P. Fortuny, and P. Gadea, "A survey on paracomplex geometry", *Rocky Mount. J. Math.* **26** (1996), 83–115.

[9] Y. Euh, C. H. Jeong and J. H. Park, "A remark concerning universal curvature identities on 4-dimensional Riemannian manifolds", *Bull. Korean Math. Soc.* **49** (2012), 1081–1088.

[10] Y. Euh, J. H. Park, and K. Sekigawa, "A Curvature identity on a 4-dimensional Riemannian manifold", *Results in Mathematics*, DOI : 10.1007/s00025-011-0164-3.

[11] Y. Euh, J. H. Park, and K. Sekigawa, "A generalization of 4-dimensional Einstein manifold", to appear *Mathematica Slovaca*.

[12] Y. Euh, J. H. Park and K. Sekigawa, "Critical metrics for quadratic functionals in the curvatures on 4-dimensional manifolds", *Differ. Geom. Appl.,* **29** (2011), 642–646.

[13] Y. Euh, J. H. Park, and K. Sekigawa, "Curvature identities derived from the first Pontrjagin number", to appear *Differ. Geom. Appl.*

[14] E. García-Río, P. Gilkey, S. Nikčević, and R. Vázquez-Lorenzo, *Applications of Affine and Weyl Geometry*, Morgan & Claypool (forthcoming).

[15] P. Gilkey and S. Nikčević, "(para)-Kähler Weyl structures" (to appear *GEOGRA*) http://arxiv.org/abs/1204.0724.

[16] P. Gilkey, S. Nikčević, and U. Simon, "Geometric realizations, curvature decompositions, and Weyl manifolds", *J. Geom. Phys.* **61** (2011), 270–275.

[17] P. Gilkey, J. H. Park, and K. Sekigawa, "Universal curvature identities", *Differ. Geom. Appl.* **29** (2011), 770–778.

[18] A. Gray, "Curvature identities for Hermitian and almost Hermitian manifolds", *Tôhoku Math. J.* **28** (1976), 601–612.

[19] A. Gray and L. M. Hervella, "The sixteen classes of almost Hermitian manifolds and their linear invariants", *Ann. di Mat. Pura Appl.* **123** (1980), 35–58.

[20] R. Hildebrand, "Half-dimensional immersions in para-Kähler manifolds", *Int. Electron. J. Geom.* **4** (2011), 85–113.

[21] S. Kobayshi and K. Nomizu, "Foundations of Differential Geometry", *Intersci. Tracts Pure & Appl Math* **15** Vol II (1963), John Wiley & Sons.

[22] G. M. Kuz'mina, "Some generalizations of the Riemann spaces of Einstein", *Math. Notes* **16** (1974), 961–963; translation from *Mat. Zametki* **16** (1974), 619–622.

[23] M.-L. Labbi, "Double forms, curvature structures and the (p, q)-curvatures", *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* **357** (2005), 3971–3992.

[24] M.-L. Labbi, "On Gauss-Bonnet Curvatures", *SIGMA, Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl.* **3**, Paper 118, 11 p., electronic only (2007).

[25] M.-L. Labbi, "Variational properties of the Gauss-Bonnet curvatures", *Calc. Var.* **32** (2008), 175–189.

[26] J. Lee, J. H. Park, and K. Sekigawa, "Curvature identities derived from an integral formula for the first Chern number", to appear *Bull. Korean Math. Soc.*

[27] C. Mengenhini, "Clifon-Pohl torus and geodesic completeness by a 'complex' point of view", *Complex Var. Theory Appl.* **49** (2004), 833-836.

[28] C. Misner, "The flatter regions of Newman, Unti, and Tamburino's generalized Schwarschild space", *J. Math. Phys.* **4** (1963), 924–937.

[29] S. P. Novikov, "Topological invariance of rational classes of Pontrjagin", *Dokl. Akcd. Nauk SSSR* **163** (1965), 298–300.

[30] F. Tricerri and L. Vanhecke, "Curvature tensors on almost Hermitian manifolds", *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **267** (1981), 365–398.

[31] H. Weyl, *The classical groups*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton (1946) (8^{th} printing).

[32] H. Weyl, *Space-time matter* (1922), Dover Publ.

[33] W. T. Wu, "Sur la structure presque complexe d'une variété différentiable réelle de dimension 4", *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **227** (1948), 1076–1078.

YE and JHP: Department of Mathematics, Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon 440-746, Korea, and the Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Seoul 130-722, Korea
E-mail address: `prettyfish@skku.edu and parkj@skku.edu`

PG: Mathematics Department, University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403 USA
E-mail address: `gilkey@uoregon.edu`

KS: Department of Mathematics, Niigata University, Niigata, Japan.
E-mail address: `sekigawa@math.sc.niigata-u.ac.jp`